VINDICATION

OF THE

GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S RESOLUTION

TO

ACCEPT GRANTS IN AID,

AS OFFERED IN THE

DESPATCH OF THE HONOURABLE THE COURT OF DIRECTORS OF THE EAST INDIA COMPANY,

OF JULY 1854.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM LEITCH, A.M.,

MINISTER OF MONIMAIL.

EDINBURGH:

MYLES MACPHAIL, 11 ST DAVID STREET.

GLASGOW: THOMAS MURRAY & SON.

MDCCCLVII.

Price One Shilling.

F1028
1857L

VINDICATION &c.

It would be contrary to all precedent, to expect that the Church of Christ should, without encountering fiery trials, achieve any new triumph, or gain any new vantage ground. The kingdoms of this world are yet to become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, but Satan's strongholds are not to be stormed without the fiercest opposition. In her struggle for the advancement of the kingdom of God, she must expect opposition from two quarters: she must be prepared for opposition from the open enemies of the truth; but she must also look for resistance, and often in the bitterest form, from professing and sometimes real friends. We have only to look to the first propagation of the gospel, —to the period of the Reformation,—and indeed to any period of religious awakening, to find that the bitterest opposition has come from within the Church. And this is not difficult to be accounted for. Alas! do we not sometimes find, even in Christian hearts, a spirit of self-sufficiency overlaying, for a time, the interests of truth and righteousness. Such men are unwilling to be disturbed in the quiet routine of official duty; and they dread, above all things, the very appearance of innovation, though it be only the innovation of new life. Men of this type do wonderfully well as long as they

53076

are allowed to carry out their own preconceived notions, and to assume that their own peculiar crotchets are not mere accidents, but of the essence of religion. When, however, new life awakens in the Church, and new modes of action are demanded, the interests of true piety are apt to be sacrificed on the altar of prejudice and obstinacy. How often does it happen, in seasons of revival from the presence of the Lord, when something like a Pentecostal effusion comes down upon a neighbourhood, that ministers, who have long maintained the respectability of their office, are changed into sceptics and scoffers. Like the Samaritan lord, they say, " If the windows of heaven were opened, might such a thing be ;" and, while thus doubting of the reality of the work, their usefulness is trodden under foot. How often, too, is the good work maligned, the genuineness of the zeal of God's servants called in question, and even God's Word employed to retard God's work. Such fiery trials are perhaps needful for the Church. They try her earnestness and steadfastness, and the position at last gained is all the more valued for the struggle it has cost.

Such being the case in every new awakening, and in every new opening for more vigorous action, it is not to be wondered at, that the marvellous opening in India, which God in his providence has brought about, should be the occasion of bitter hostility, on the part of some, who might have been expected to hail with joy so unexpected and unexampled an opportunity for the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom. How true to all times the expression of the Apostle, " A great door and effectual is opened unto me; and there are many adversaries." Where do we ever find a great door, without finding many adversaries in front and behind ?

open enemies in front, bidding defiance to our entrance, and professing friends behind, by their apathy or direct opposition, clogging the movements of the Church when entering upon a career of triumph. The song of the priests of old, when bearing the ark, must still be the war-note of the Missionary church, when going forth to new fields of enterprise, with the message of salvation in her hand, " Let God arise ; let his enemies be scattered."

The decision of the Assembly of last year, on the subject of India Grants, will form the second great era in the Missionary history of the Church of Scotland.* It was in 1824 that the India Mission was originated ; and, after the lapse of exactly thirty years, the Court of Directors of the East India Company issued, in 1854, its educational despatch to the Governor-General of India in Council. In 1855 the subject was brought before the Assembly, and a deliverance was come to adverse to the acceptance of Grants. The discussion took place on a Saturday, when the house was almost empty. No pains had been taken to inform the Assembly of the momentous character of the measure before them ; and, in almost entire ignorance of the subject, the Church of Scotland was committed to a course most

* The Church, when founding the India Mission, met with opposition even greater than the present. The deliverance of the Assembly was as follows :—" That while the General Assembly cannot but regret that the authorities of India, in the view of the great and interesting object which they seek to secure, consider themselves precluded, by the present state of the general population, from making religious instruction, according to the ' truth as it is in Jesus,' imperative in every seminary to which they give special countenance and pecuniary assistance, the General Assembly are now, on further and mature consideration, fully satisfied that the terms and conditions, as set forth in the Despatch on which Grants in Aid are offered, are such as, in perfect consistency with sound principle, and in accordance with the duty of the Church in this matter, may be taken advantage of for the benefit of the schools established in connection with the General Assembly's Mission in India. The General Assembly accordingly resolve to sanction and authorise the acceptance of said Grants, and to take advantage thereof, as well for the erection of additional schools in places most suitable, as for the support, as far as possible, of those already existing."

injurious to the best interests of her Missions. Fortunately a protesting voice was loudly raised against this rash and inconsiderate step. It was that of Dr Bryce, whose prompt and decisive action in this case will long be remembered by the friends of the India Mission. In the division he stood almost alone; but, confident in the goodness of his cause, he, soon after the rising of the Assembly, published his Appeal. It was a notice of this pamphlet in the *Christian Magazine* that first opened the eyes of the Church to the unfortunate course pursued by the India Committee in the Assembly. The spirited correspondence that ensued, between the Convener of the Scheme and the Editor of the Magazine, helped still farther to draw the attention of the Church to the subject. While the Editor withdrew a remark, which seemed to imply that the Committee *intentionally* arranged matters with a view to avoid discussion, the great fact became palpable to all, that the *effect* of the arrangement was to keep the Assembly in ignorance of the momentous question on which it was called to decide. The best apology that can be made for the Committee is, that they were not fully aware of the importance of the question, and did not, therefore, deem it necessary to disturb the Church by a discussion of its merits. As soon as the Church came to know the real state of things, a loud demand was made, in Presbyteries and Synods, to have the matter reconsidered in the Assembly; and, what was calculated at first to repress inquiry, was found, in the end, to be the most effectual means of rousing the Church to vigorous action. Seldom has a Missionary question received such attention in our subordinate Church Courts. There was hardly a Presbytery in which the merits of the question were not

thoroughly sifted, and the animated discussions that ensued showed how deep was the interest excited. The friends of Missions looked forward, with no ordinary anxiety and suspense, to the ensuing Assembly. Would the Assembly have the courage to reverse its decision—awkward though that step might appear? Would the Church, braving the threats of resignation, and of attempts to tamper with the Christian liberality of her people, pronounce for the truth, instead of attempting, by weak compromise, to soothe the wounded feelings of officials. Nobly did the Assembly redeem its character from any suspicion of cowardly weakness. By the overwhelming majority of 195 to 65, did the Church retrace her steps. She proclaimed that she would not be contented to stand aloof, as an alien, from the commonwealth of Israel; that she was resolved to co-operate with the various Evangelistic Churches of Christendom in conveying to the millions of India the blessings of the gospel message. No one could have listened to the discussion without feeling thankful to God that Scotland had yet a General Assembly not ashamed to confess its error, and, at the bidding of God, sacrifice the spirit of self-sufficiency on the altar of truth. Whatever acrimony may have been displayed, previous to last Assembly, and since, there was no feeling exhibited on this occasion but what was becoming a great national and religious assembly, discussing one of the most momentous questions ever brought before a Church Court. The minority, though conscious of impending defeat, used no weapon forbidden either by courtesy or Christian feeling; and it was a matter of devout gratitude to most that this great question had been, on the whole, so amicably settled.

It must have been, therefore, with pain and surprise, that the friends of Missions perused Dr Veitch's pamphlet reviving the agitation, and urging arguments in a spirit not usually displayed in the holy cause of Missions. The movement has been taken up in some of our Church Courts, and, again, the subject must occupy the attention of the Assembly. In these circumstances, it may be of advantage to review the whole subject, and present, in a condensed form, the arguments employed on both sides of the question.

In conducting the inquiry, I shall take Dr Veitch's pamphlet as giving the fullest summary of the arguments employed by the opponents of the measure. There is, indeed, no argument in it which has not, in some form or another, been brought before the Church already; but it is convenient to refer to it as representing the sentiments of those who hold extreme views on one side of the question. The chief points demanding attention are—the spirit of the pamphlet; the principle involved in the acceptance of the Grants in Aid; and the expediency of such acceptance.

I. *The spirit of Dr Veitch's Pamphlet.*—It is deeply to be deplored that a controversy should be pursued in such a manner as to fix attention upon the temper in which it is conducted rather than the merits of the question itself. No one can rise from the perusal of this pamphlet, without being impressed far more deeply with its unhappy spirit, than with the arguments adduced. I do not mean that the language is strong and uncompromising; such language is rather to be admired than condemned, when the interests of truth and righteousness are at stake. "First pure, and then peaceable," is the law of Christian charity. No honeyed

phrases are to be used when the stern language of honest indignation is demanded. It would be madness to make use of a mere soothing application when the disease imperatively demands the cautery or the surgeon's knife. But to be strong and uncompromising it is not necessary for a writer to transgress the ordinary rules of Christian courtesy and charity. The transgression of these rules must only weaken the cause it is employed to support. Vague vituperation, disguised personalities, and the imputation of unworthy motives, are proscribed even in quarters where no high standard of Christian morality is exacted ; and surely it is but reasonable that those clothed with the sacred function of the Ministry should, in discussing the great questions affecting the moral and religious interests of mankind, adhere to a standard of courtesy and charity, which at least does not sink below the standard of the world. It would certainly be more agreeable to pass over, in sadness and silence, many passages illustrative of the unhappy spirit referred to ; but the unfair and ungenerous attacks upon the parties opposed to his views forbid that they should escape without notice.

What can be more unfair than the insinuation thrown out as to genuineness of the zeal of those who have advocated the acceptance of the Grants in Aid? " In quarters where, hitherto, even in times of greatest exigency, the Mission had failed to receive support, there were manifestations of zeal and eloquence which might seem to imply that it had always been regarded as of vital importance." Is not this a distinct insinuation that those who interested themselves in the settlement of the question by the acceptance of Grants, were actuated by other motives than the good of souls, and the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom.

How easy is it to make such vague charges, if one could only stoop to such a line of argument. This is the staple argument which the servants of God in every age have had to encounter. This is the style of argument with which our Lord and his disciples—the Protestant reformers—and the leaders in every holy movement have been assailed. It is a weapon most easy of employment; but, as an argument, it can only derive strength from the evil propensity in the human heart to which it addresses itself.

An insinuation of a still graver charge is contained in the following sentence: "Whilst, on the one hand, the propriety of accepting the Grants was urged by appeals to authority, which those in any way dependent on the favour of the India Board might have difficulty in resisting; on the other hand, the rejection of the Grants was represented as equivalent to the abandonment of the principles on which the Mission had been originally established, and hitherto successfully carried on." Here is the distinct insinuation of corrupt motives. The favour of the India Board is represented as the mercenary inducement to accept their Grants. The absurdity of the argument is only equalled by the monstrous character of the charge. Such arguments are so unusual among Christian men, and, above all, when dealing with the character of Christian Ministers, that one naturally hesitates to believe that this is really the meaning of the sentence; but no extent of charity can force upon the words a different meaning. The most bitter enemies of Christianity could hardly bring such a railing accusation against the brethren. And if Dr Veitch believes in his own accusation, as we are bound to take for granted that he does, I am persuaded that there is not

another man in Scotland who could conceive that any mercenary regard to the favour of the India Board actuated a single Minister of the Church, in deciding upon the Grants-in-Aid question.

We have the following contrast between the Assembly of 1856 and that of 1855: "In numbers, and in the time devoted to discussion, last Assembly must be admitted to have the advantage; but it may well be questioned whether it had so in the talent and character of the speakers, and in the tone and temper manifested in conducting the debate." Is it good taste or sound principle to make the settlement of any question depend on the character of those who debate it? The Church of Scotland has been accustomed to look to the Bible as the great standard of truth, instead of invidious comparisons of character. The question at issue involves great principles which can only be settled by an appeal to the Divine Oracles. Were it matter of mere expediency, character might have some weight; but when vital principle is involved, as in the present case, our only appeal must be to the law and to the testimony. As to the expression of the mind of the Church, it is simply ridiculous to compare the Assembly of 1855 with that of 1856. There was no discussion worthy of the name in the Assembly of 1855. There were not half a dozen members who had the opportunity of fully acquainting themselves with the merits of the question. Though the decision was, formally, that of the Assembly, it was virtually that of the India Committee. In 1856 the Church pronounced a decision with her eyes open. For a whole year, the subject had been discussed in every form, and there was not a single member who had not the most ample opportunity of acquainting himself

with the merits of the question. The admirable discussion of 1856 proved how fully the importance of the subject was appreciated, and how intelligently the subject had been mastered. After months of deliberation, Dr Veitch has presented no aspect of the question which was not then discussed. With what reason, therefore, can he maintain that the question did not obtain a fair hearing?

The sneer at the founder of the India Mission is anything but in good taste. "The name of its venerable founder was tauntingly referred to, as though the threatened outrage would disturb his saintly repose." Is it, then, a weakness to mention, with reverence and affection, such names as that of Dr Inglis? Woe be to the Church of Scotland when she has learned to speak lightly of the great and good, who have, by their piety, Christian wisdom, and unwearied labour, shed lustre on her history. If there is one name more than another, that deserves to be held in affectionate veneration at the present moment, it is that of Dr Inglis. The well-affected to Missions have always looked up to him as one whose name will ever occupy a conspicuous place in the History of Missions; but his true greatness is only now fully manifesting itself. The establishment which he planned in 1824, and which was subsequently carried out under Dr Duff, has been regarded as the very model of a Missionary institution. Every Missionary body in India has, more or less, borrowed its plan of operation from this institution. The Governors-General of India have vied with each other in acknowledging its excellence. Missionaries, and the Christian community of India, have proclaimed, with one voice, the profound wisdom which planned the system of operation. But the excellence of the original

plan did not consist merely in its meeting the wants of the native population at the outset of our operation. Its basis was such as to admit of an expansion adapted to the progressive evangelization of India. While the educational character was the most prominent at the outset, he foresaw that a time would come when this element, though not merging in, must be subsidiary to, the direct preaching of the gospel. In the course of this controversy the idea has been thrown out as something novel, that the due development of our institution is towards the preaching of the gospel, as the ultimate end of our enterprise. Now all this is provided for in the original plan. The founder never lost sight of this ; and though the process adopted by him might appear slow, he saw that it was the one by which the most abundant harvest was ultimately to be reaped. One cannot read the "Letter to the People of Scotland,"* in which there is a full exposition of the plan of operations, and view the principles there laid down in the light of the present controversy, without being duly impressed with the marvellous sagacity of the man who could, through a long series of coming years, foresee the various wants which the gradual expansion of his scheme was calculated to meet. Is it possible, then, to mention the name of Dr Inglis without feelings of reverence and gratitude ? And is it right to sneer at this as a weakness ?

Common fairness requires that, in controversy, the position of an opponent should not be overstated, and that, if possible, his language should be given. Let his avowed sentiments be condemned with any degree of severity, but a sacred regard to truth should keep us from putting into his mouth sentiments which he

* See Appendix A.

may repudiate with horror. We give as an illustration of what we mean the following passage: "The great aim of the majority seemed to be, to establish for themselves a character of high-minded liberality, which could accommodate itself to the changes and necessities of the times, and must be guided by the large maxims of a salutary expediency, rather than by the precise and impracticable rules of antiquated creeds and systems. 'Let us inaugurate,' it was virtually said, 'a new and more enlightened policy—let men no longer speak of the secular as a Godless system of education—let us not be suspicious of our rulers, but respond to their proposals with generous confidence—let us not lag behind, but as men of progress commit ourselves to the spirit of the age—let us cultivate flexibility.'" Such a wholesale libel on the Church of Scotland—for the majority in their decision represented the Church at large—fills one with utter amazement. But the universality of the charge is only equalled by its injustice. Can Dr Veitch be ignorant of the fact, that the avowed principles of the majority were the very reverse of what they are here stated to have been; that they opposed the views of Dr Veitch on the ground that they were both unscriptural and calculated to retard the cause of religious education in India. No doubt the author was quite at liberty to endeavour to prove the contrary; but no license entitles him to represent the majority as, consciously, acting in opposition to their creed and their professed principles as Christian Ministers.

The following passage is open to a similar remark. It refers to a Statement of the Acting Committee, circulated soon after the rising of the last Assembly: "All that the Committee, in their zeal for the propagation

of the gospel among the heathen, venture to say regarding the secular system of the Despatch, and its indispensable religious neutrality, is that they express no approval of it. They would have us believe that the question as to Grants in Aid is something quite distinct, and altogether detached from the system of the Despatch ; and that this involves in it no responsibility, beyond what arises from the Government rules and inspection. To cast into the flames a few grains of incense was all that was required of the early Christian martyr, yet this act, in itself so trifling, he would not perform to save his life, because it would have involved him in the guilt of idolatry." Surely this is not language to be used towards a servant of the Church, put in charge of one of the most onerous and responsible offices—for, of course, the charge is specially directed against the Convener of the Committee who drew up the Statement. The Church is laid under no ordinary debt of gratitude to Dr Craik, by his almost heroic resolution to accept in the emergency the Convenership of the Foreign Missions Committee. By the unanimous feeling of the Assembly, he was indicated as the man best fitted to meet this crisis in the history of the Mission. He attempted the duty in the midst of many difficulties. He could not but expect much irritated feeling on the part of those who had supported the views of the minority. He had before him the prospect of unexampled labour in expanding the Mission so as to take advantage of the new field which God in his providence had opened up. Still, undismayed by these prospects, he felt bound in duty to the Church and his Divine Master to undertake the task. Surely if anything could disarm hostility, and rebuke the ebullition of irritated feelings, it was

this spirit of self-sacrifice. Yet, so little sympathy is felt for him in his holy work and labour of love, that he is compared to a martyr burning a little incense, and so denying the faith. Unquestionably, the author was quite entitled to doubt whether the Convener was pursuing a right course; but it is certainly not in accordance with the rules of Christian courtesy to represent him as doing, intentionally, what he knows to be wrong; and this is necessarily implied in the illustration of the burning of incense.

The use of Scripture, in this pamphlet, cannot be passed over in silence. The Ministerial office has its special temptations, and one of these is the unwarrantable use of Scripture language as the vehicle of irritated feelings. Scripture language and imagery are so familiar to the Minister of the gospel, that, unless prayerful watch is kept upon the lips, texts of Scripture are apt to be employed, merely to barb the darts of anger, and make them rankle deeper in the heart of an opponent. If Dr Veitch, instead of ransacking Scripture for poisoned weapons to launch at his adversaries, had gone to the Divine Oracles for light to direct the Church in this emergency, he would have done good service. When God, in his providence, opens up a new path for the Church, he, at the same time, gives her requisite light to guide her along that path. When Israel was called out of Egypt, and commanded to cross the Red Sea, there was a pillar of fire to light up the perilous path, and a rod to direct her in her course. And the Church, when called to enter on any high enterprise, need not despair of finding in Scripture, "A lamp unto her feet, and a light unto her path." How sad is it, then, to find that Scripture is dispensed with as a guide, and employed

merely as a vehicle for the irritated feelings of party strife. Perhaps the most reprehensible use of Scripture, is the searching in its sacred pages for nicknames to fasten upon the servants of God. Much ingenuity and tact may be displayed in this line of argument, and a brilliant stroke may sometimes be effected; but a temporary triumph, gained by a jest, at the expense of Scripture, is too dearly won. When Dr Veitch compares his opponents to Jannes and Jambres withstanding Moses to the face, and to Elymas the sorcerer turning away the deputy from the faith, he has employed a weapon that most frequently recoils upon him who is unscrupulous enough to use it. He has learned, to his cost, that others can use the weapon as well as himself, and give it a keener edge, too. I allude to the sad and unseemly scene in the Presbytery of Edinburgh, where a hot and not very edifying discussion arose, as to who most fitly represented, in the present controversy, these Scripture personages.*

* It was understood that the allusion in the pamphlet to Jannes and Jambres had special reference to the present Convener of the India Committee and the Editor of the *Christian Magazine*, who first withstood the attempt to shelve the question of Grants in Aid without discussion. By Elymas the sorcerer, Dr Bryce was understood to be meant, from his conjuring the minority of 9 into the majority of 195 It will be seen, by the following extract from the newspaper report of the discussion in the Presbytery, that Dr Barclay attempted to turn the tables against the ingenious framer of this Scripture riddle:—

"Under the guidance of conscience, Dr Veitch has likened the majority of the last Assembly, the members of the committee for the Foreign Mission, and all of us who differ from him, to Jannes and Jambres, and Elymas the sorcerer. Now, Sir, I should no more have thought of attacking the characters of my brethren by such a comparison, than I should have thought of assaulting and injuring their persons; but since the unseemly comparison has been made, I am relieved from the imputation of doing that which I censure in Dr Veitch, if, in repelling the application of these characters to myself and my friends, I shall make the charge recoil on Dr Veitch and his friends, by showing that to them, if to any, the obnoxious characters belong. First, then, of Jannes and Jambres. We are told by the apostle that they 'withstood Moses,' and it is therefore necessary to advert to the circumstances under which they did so. Moses was commissioned to deliver the children of Israel from the bondage of Egypt; Jannes and Jambres withstood him in the execution of his mission. The Church of Scotland is engaged, I hope not without a commission, in aiding to deliver the na-

The rulers of India come off no better than the Church. Scripture is, also, in their case, so wrested as to consign them to Divine vengeance. "Miserable policy! Can it be believed, that men calling themselves Christians would reckon it the indispensable condition of their Christian rule,—the bulwark of their empire, the perpetuating of its tranquillity,—that they should respect the spiritual dominion of Satan, and avoid offending him, by violating religious neutrality, and confessing Christ, 'He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision, then shall he speak to them in his wrath and vex them in his sore displeasure.'" If the author calculated on attacking, with impunity, the rulers of India, he has been grievously disappointed. An elder of the

tives of India from the bondage of ignorance, and error, and superstition; and in this high and holy enterprise, who are withstanding the Church? Wherever we are to look for the antitypes of Jannes and Jambres, it assuredly is not amongst the supporters of the India Mission; they cannot be withstanding themselves. To their opponents, therefore, if to any, these characters must be appropriated. The apostle puts Jannes foremost, and if he is to be represented by any one who occupies the foremost place among the withstanders of the General Assembly, the overture we are now discussing guides us at once to the Jannes of the Church of Scotland. But who is Jambres? Perhaps etymology may aid us in that inquiry. Jambres, Sir, signifies literally 'a bitter opposer.' Who, then, has been the most virulent opposer of the Assembly's Scheme, and of all engaged in supporting it? Let the pamphlet which is the subject of these strictures give the answer, and let its author temper the bitterness of his next controversial work with some small infusion of Christian charity. It remains, Sir, to dispose of Elymas the sorcerer, to whom we are politely compared, although it surpasses my powers of comprehension to perceive what particular charge Dr Veitch could intend to couch under the comparison. Elymas, we are told, endeavoured to 'turn away the deputy from the faith.' Has any one of Dr Veitch's friends been striving by the sorcery of his pen, or his tongue, or his personal influence, to turn away his congregation from all faith and confidence in the Assembly and its committee? Has that friend proved his skill in sorcery by performing the hocus-pocus trick of conjuring money from one place of deposit to another—from one place to another? To such a man (Dr Barclay pointed to Dr Muir) may the sobriquet of 'Elymas the sorcerer' be applied with much less impropriety than to any of Dr Veitch's opponents." The terms of the Overture from the Presbytery of Edinburgh are such as to call for the gravest notice on the part of the Assembly. If such disrespectful and unconstitutional language is allowed towards the Supreme Judicatory of the Church, all subordination is at an end, and all unity of action of Missionary enterprise must be despaired of.

Church of Scotland, lately occupying the elevated position of member of the Supreme Council of India, and enjoying the confidence of the Church so fully as to be made chairman of the Missionary Board at Calcutta, has come forward to defend the rulers of India from unjust aspersions.* He has also administered a calm, dignified, and Christian-like rebuke, which, coming from one who has laboured so long in the missionary cause, must be felt to have no ordinary weight. Can it be matter of surprise, that men who have borne the brunt and heat of the missionary work in India should be sometimes roused to indignation, when, instead of gaining the sympathy of Christian ministers at home, they are themselves bitterly assailed, and all their labours of love in the cause of Christ misinterpreted.

It is with a sense of relief that I turn from this personal aspect of the controversy. It is deeply to be deplored that personalities should arise in discussing a question which, above all others, should be free from such asperities. No controversy can, it is true, be carried on without some amount of personal allusion; but both courtesy and Christianity demand that, in attacking an adversary's position, we give him the credit of acting conscientiously. In what follows, it will be my aim to show that the position of Dr Veitch and his followers, while unscriptural as to principle, is altogether indefensible as to policy; but, while doing so, I should be inflicting the greatest injury on the cause I advocate, by insinuating, in the most distant manner, that they are actuated by any other than the most honourable and conscientious motives; and by the firm

* See "Letter to the Rev. James Veitch, D.D., upon the title of his recent pamphlet, by John Lewis, Esq. of Plean."

conviction that the course they are pursuing, however wrong in itself, is the right one.

II. *The Question of Principle.*—While many of the minority were opposed to the acceptance of the India Grants, merely on the ground of *expediency*, others endeavoured to cover their position, by assailing the *principle* of these Grants. Some, even, have so far misunderstood the real bearing of the question as to complain that the majority should insist on carrying out their views, as a matter of expediency, while the minority stood on the high ground of principle. No delusion could be greater than this. Altogether apart from the practical question, there is a momentous principle involved, which the Church vindicated by her late decision. Since the time of Constantine, no question affecting the relation of the civil power to the Christian Church has emerged of so much moment. It is a question that concerns not merely India, but every nation in Christendom. The whole question of religious education is wrapped up in the problem of the India Grants in Aid. The point simply is, How are we, in a divided Christian community, to secure the religious element in education? In Scotland, when there was virtually only one religious body, the matter was at once solved by blending the school with the national Church, and so drawing, from the same source, a guarantee for the religious element in the school as well as the pulpit. It ought never be forgotten, in this question, that the State does not enforce religion *directly* in the parish school. It would be altogether inconsistent with the spiritual independence maintained by the Church to admit of this. There is no *civil* enactment requiring the Bible to be taught. The state merely

puts the Church in a position to enjoin, by her own independent authority, the teaching of religion. It is the living influence of the Church upon the school that secures its religious character, and the test, which the State enjoins, is useful in as far only as it confers a jurisdiction through which this influence may be applied. Constituted as the parish schools are, the present test is absolutely essential for the maintenance of her jurisdiction; but a grave error is committed, when, in defence of our institutions, doctrinal tests are advocated, as if they could, *per se*, guarantee the religious element. Tests are worse than useless, if they do not serve as a bond to connect the school with the Church. If the jurisdiction of the Church were absolute, and not limited, as in the parish schools, there would be no need of tests. In the General Assembly's schools no test is required, and yet there is a stronger guarantee for the religious element. How is this? Simply because the Church's control over these schools is absolute, and does not require to be secured by a test as in the parish schools, where the action of the heritors limits her jurisdiction.*

It is all important to keep clearly in view, that the essential and fundamental feature of the parish-school system, which has been so long the glory of Scotland, is its dependence upon the Church for its religious character. No State guarantee would serve the same purpose. The Church claims, as her inalienable prerogative, the spiritual jurisdiction of the school. She cannot, without sin, surrender this prerogative to the civil power; for this would be giving to Cæsar what

* The Missionary Schools will occupy precisely the same position as the Assembly's Schools at home, which receive Privy Council Grants, and are yet under the exclusive control of the Church.

belongs to God. Kings may be nursing fathers, and queens nursing mothers to the Church, without robbing her of her spiritual functions ; and she would be thus robbed were the State to undertake *directly* the enforcement of the spiritual element in the school. The Church is as much bound to bring home Christ to the hearts of the young in the school, as she is to preach Christ to the adult in the church, and, in both spheres of activity, she can recognise only Christ as her head.

While the Church claims, as her divine right, the exclusive superintendence of the religious element in her schools, the experience of every Christian country testifies, that there can be no effective religious teaching, on a national scale, where there is not a living bond between the Church and the school. Turn, for example, to Prussia ; here religion is indeed enforced ; the Bible is read, creeds and catechisms are taught ; but the religious guarantee comes from a wrong source. The Church is practically ignored ; the government has assumed her functions ; and what is the result ? Why, that the teaching, as to its effects, is not only secular but antichristian. The teachers are government officers, who drill their scholars, in their creeds and catechisms, as a sergeant does his recruits on the parade ground. They often scoff at what they teach ; and their pupils learn to regard Christianity as a curious mythology, instead of a revelation from the living and true God. Is it matter of surprise that the end of all this should be open infidelity and anarchy ?* What makes this case the more striking is, that the schoolmasters faithfully performed the intellectual part

* " In the broad glare of the revolutionary history of 1848 ; in that chaos of contusion, delusion, and dreams, where socialists raved, and the infidel and the mob plundered, the leaders were the schoolmasters and their scholars the masses." (*A Letter to the Right Honourable S. H. Walpole, M.P., by J. S. Colquhoun, Esq.*)

of their religious duties. Their scholars were not left in ignorance of the Scriptures. As a literary task, they knew the Scriptures better than the children of our parish schools. Their ingenuity was, however, exercised only in its debatable points; and, trained in the school of Strauss, they were, even in childhood, ripening into mature infidels. It was not at all the design of government that things should end in this way. Religion was fostered in the school as a State necessity, and it was expected that government could as easily drill children into Christianity as it could drill raw recruits into soldiers. In 1854, it was proclaimed officially* by the Council of Education that the system was a complete failure, both as to the secular and the religious element, and it then underwent a complete revolution.† More stringent measures were adopted for securing the religious character of the teaching; but the fatal element of State control was still retained. The mechanical power of government, instead of the spiritual power of the Church, was again in more urgent request; but when the Divine method of securing the religious element is thus wantonly disregarded, can anything but a signal failure be expected?

What is the conclusion from all this, but that the State is warranted to give religious education to the people, only through the medium of the Church, and

* Die drei Preussischen Regulat. Von F. Stiehl.

† It is remarkable that, even in regard to amount, education is very defective in Prussia. The theory is, that one in six of the population should be at school; but by recent statistics the following startling facts have been brought to light. In 1851–2, in the province of Prussia, it was found that in the army, taken from all classes of the people, there were 10·4 without any education whatever, 44·29 with defective education, and 44·31 with satisfactory education. This lamentable deficiency exists, too, under a compulsory system. The matter is accounted for by the want of a religious stimulus, and by the spirit of resistance against a mechanical compulsion. The tendency to evasion is so general that the law cannot be enforced.

that State aid must be given, in such a way, as to leave the Church quite unfettered in the superintendence of her schools. But the great difficulty, in a divided Christian community, is to engage the efforts of the Christian Church in infusing the religious element into the education of the people. There are only two ways in which it has been proposed to effect this object. The one is the parish-school system, in which each school is superintended by a single religious body, empowered to inculcate a definite system of religious doctrine. The other is the common-school system, in which all denominations unite in the management of each school. This is the system of America, which has been so much lauded. When schools were first instituted in New England, the people were most desirous to give their schools a religious character; but, in proportion to their anxiety, was the difficulty of fixing on any system of religious doctrine. Each sect stood up for its own peculiar tenets, and looked, with the utmost jealousy, on any attempt to favour other sects. It was at last found, that if any definite system of religion was taught, the community would be kept in a constant state of ferment. By universal consent, and at a time when the community was most anxious to have their children religiously educated, it was resolved, virtually, to banish religion from the school. The Bible is read, but only as a class-book, and the teacher is strictly forbidden to make any comment on what is read. What is the practical result? Why, that these schools are found to be nurseries of infidelity. There is but one opinion, now, among the religious classes of America, that the common school is exercising the most disastrous influence on the character of the people. This is so much felt, that the various churches are now

actively erecting schools, to be under their own immediate and undivided superintendence. The Presbyterian bodies, the Episcopal Communion, the Synod of the German Reformed Church, and the Lutherans, have already moved in this direction. It is a singular circumstance, and worthy of remark, that they call their schools *parish schools.* They have gone to Scotland for their model; and fixing at once upon the essential element,—not the territorial idea, but the ecclesiastical,—they have resolved to have the only true guarantee for a religious education, viz., the unfettered jurisdiction of the Church; and this, too, while they are compelled to pay a heavy tax, equal to L.2 for each child at school. The same attempt was made, in Canada, to combine religion with the common-school system, but it is well known how signal has been the failure. Each Church is now rearing schools of its own, in which a system of definite doctrine may be taught. Strange! that Scotland should be seriously thinking of abandoning her own system, in favour of the common-school system, at the very moment when other countries are proclaiming the utter failure of the latter, and are falling back on the former, as the only sure guarantee for a religious education. Whether, then, the religious guarantee comes from the State, or the various religious bodies in a united capacity, the result is equally the same,—a godless education.*

* See "Remarks on the Common School System of the United States, in a Letter to the Right Honourable Earl Granville, by Archdeacon Sinclair, Treasurer of the National School Society." The startling facts revealed in this letter should be seriously pondered by all who look to America for a model of National Education. The Pamphlet has all the greater weight, as it comes from one who may be regarded as the representative of the educational activity of the Church of England. He sees no possibility of a religious system of national

We are driven, then, to the parish-school system as the only one that can effectually secure a religious education. If, therefore, this country is ever to have a religious system of education, commensurate with the wants of the people, it must be after the type of the parish school, in which the great distinctive element is the unfettered jurisdiction of one religious body over each school. The Church of Scotland had, in 1849, the sagacity to perceive that it was only by extending the church-and-school system to other religious bodies, a national system could be constructed, in which the religious element would be secured, and the parish schools still retained in connection with the Church of Scotland. In her solemn Protest, Declaration, and Testimony of 1849, she declared, while vindicating her unfettered jurisdiction over the parish schools, that she, "by no means looked, with an envious eye, on the aid given by the State to educational institutions of other Christian denominations." Instead of arrogating an exclusive right to control the religious education of the whole people of Scotland, she proclaimed her willingness that other Churches should receive State aid, and co-operate with her in the great work of the godly upbringing of the young. So important was this declaration considered, that it stands upon the records of the Church, as one of the statutes of 1849. It was not to be expected, that this step in advance for securing to Scotland the blessing of a religious education, and the stability of the institutions of the Church should be taken without much opposition. It broke up the Education Committee, and entailed a

education, except on the principle of the Privy Council Grants. The letter has at present only a private circulation, but it is hoped that it may soon be published, so that its instructive facts may become accessible to all.

protracted resistance in all respects similar to that of the present crisis, when the Church has homologated the same principle in reference to the education of India. The party, who then opposed the extension of the parish-school system, is the very party who now offer so obstinate a resistance in carrying out the Assembly's decision of last year. The only effect of this hostility, however, was to draw forth still more explicit declarations on the subject.* It is only to be regretted that the Church did not, with greater vigour, practically carry out her decisions, and so place the parish schools beyond the reach of the peril with which they are now menaced. It is not yet too late. The parish schools may be yet saved by a general adoption of the Privy Council Grants, which, without any new Parliamentary action, will put them in a higher state of efficiency than any bill has yet proposed to do. It may require vigorous action, and some sacrifice on the part of the Church; but surely the boon to be secured, the inestimable blessing of a religious education, is sufficiently great to warrant any amount of effort.†

I have entered thus into details in reference to the system of Privy Council Grants, for, without a clear understanding of this point, it is impossible to appreciate the action of the Church with reference to the India Grants in Aid. It will at once be seen, that the Church had no alternative but to sanction the principle, in India, which she had homologated at home.

It has been attempted, however, to show that the cases are not parallel, that there is a point of differ-

* See Appendix A.

† The adaptation of the Privy Council Grants to the present circumstances of the Parish Schools is fully discussed in the Pamphlet by the Rev. Mr Wilson of Paisley, entitled, "The Duty of the Church, in the present crisis, to the Schoolmaster and Herself."

ence which ought not to be overlooked. The Privy Council Grants are given only to schools where there is some religion inculcated; whereas Grants are given in India though the school is entirely secular. It is not questioned that the operation of the Grants in India are identical with those at home; but it is held that there is an important theoretical difference. Now, it is at once admitted that there is a difference; but it is a difference which removes the difficulty which might otherwise adhere to the acceptance of India Grants in Aid. The government of this country has, by its very constitution, a religious character; so that it is entitled, as *Pius et Christianus*, to take religious action in providing for the education of the country. The government of India, on the other hand, is vested in in the Court of Directors, which, by its constitution, has no religious character, and therefore is not entitled to interfere directly with the religion of the country over which it bears sway. The members of the Court of Directors may have any religion whatever; there may not be a single Christian among the whole number; and it would be altogether irreconcilable with the principles of the Church of Scotland to acknowledge any right, in this body, to interfere, authoritatively, with the religious element in constructing a system of national education. As to the Christianity of the Directors, *de facto*, I would, not for a moment, be understood as casting any doubt, in the face of the unanimous verdict of the Missionaries and the religious community of India. I am ready to acknowledge that their sway in India is altogether on the side of Christian truth. Still, as a purely secular body, having no religious status secured to them by their constitution, it would be altogether inconsistent with the principles which

the Church has always contended for, to call them to enforce directly a system of religious education. The position the Directors assume is one which saves them from committing themselves to error, as is done by the government of this country. The Privy Council, in the administrations of their Grants, recognise the religious character of the grant-receiving schools, though they do not, in any way, interfere with the religious teaching. Hence, when they bestow Grants on a Roman Catholic school, they commit themselves to the error of Popery. In India, the government escape from such a position by dealing only with the secular element ; and when they bestow grants on Roman Catholics, they take the position of saying,—We do not aid you for the Popish doctrine you teach, but for the secular education which you give our subjects, so as to fit them for the civil offices they may be called to fill. Certainly, then, the countenance given to religious error is less than in the working of the system of Grants in this country. Now, with all this direct countenance given to Popery by the Privy Council, the Church of Scotland holds that she can, without any compromise of religious truth, accept these Grants ; and she has accepted them for the Normal and Assembly Schools immediately under her own superintendence.* What inconsistency is it to maintain that the India Grants in Aid cannot, without compromise of truth, be accepted, when the conditions on which they are given, are intentionally such as to give no countenance to religious error, as such. There is a difference, then, between the India

* For the year 1855–56, the last reported on Schools in connection with the Church of Scotland received L.22,959 ; Schools of Protestant Dissenters in Scotland, L.23,516 ; Church of England Schools, L.239,997. The amount of Grants to all denominations was L.369,602.

Grants and those at home; but it is just such a difference as to remove the objections to which the home system is liable.

What, then, is the position practically assumed by the Court of Directors in regard to the religious education of India? It is this, "We, as a purely secular body, having no religious constitution, are not entitled *directly* to infuse the religious element into education. Were we to attempt this, we would hinder rather than advance the cause of Christianity. We could only sanction a scheme of education which would be a compromise between all the peculiar doctrines held conscientiously by the various members of the Court; we could teach nothing definite; if we introduced the Bible, we could not guarantee the religious views of the teachers; and, unless the Bible is taught by a religious man, authorized to inculcate a definite system of Christian doctrine, only injury to the cause of Christianity can ensue. We are, therefore, shut up to the necessity of aiding religious bodies who will be allowed the unfettered jurisdiction of their schools; and who can, therefore, deliver the whole truth as it is in Jesus without any compromise of doctrine? The necessities of government, however, compel us, in the meantime, to maintain schools of our own, to communicate those secular acquirements which are indispensable. We must support schools, in which reading, writing, arithmetic, gardening, agriculture, surgery, &c., are taught, so that the secular requirements of the State may be provided for. We cannot, consistently, blame the India government for maintaining secular colleges to prepare the youth of India for civil offices, when we allow the future ministers of the Church to be trained in the now Godless colleges of Scotland. We are fully

impressed with the vital importance of having all these branches of education leavened with Christian principle; but we feel that we are not the proper party for securing this. This is a function of the Christian Church; and we call upon all Christian bodies to undertake the work. Let them undertake to educate our subjects in all these branches, at the same time leavening them with Christian truth; and the moment they have, with our assistance, overtaken the wants of India, we let down our secular schools. The task we have ourselves assumed is anomalous, and only provisional; and we shall hail with joy the time when all our secular schools shall give way to others superintended by Christian Churches." This is virtually the language of the Directors, and the Despatch of 1854 is the embodiment of their policy. That the discontinuance of the secular schools of government, by the gradual operation of the Grants in Aid, is contemplated, is clearly laid down in the Despatch. "We look forward to the time when any general system of education, entirely provided by the government, may be discontinued, with the gradual advance of the system of Grants in Aid, and when many of the existing government institutions, especially those of a higher order, may be safely closed, or transferred to the management of local bodies under the control of, and aided by, the State."

How perverse, then, is the ingenuity that would represent the acceptance of Grants, under the Despatch, as sanctioning a system of secular education. How perverse, I say, when the very design of these grants is to ring the knell of secularism in India. These grants are not merely calculated, from their nature, to overturn the present secular system, but they are

offered by the government of India for the very purpose of effecting this object. One cannot well conceive how such a cloud of misconception should have surrounded this subject, at least in the case of the Church of Scotland; for in no other body has this misconception existed. The most probable explanation is, that many in the Church have not been attending, as they ought, to the great educational movements in our Eastern empire. It is evidently imagined, by those who have opposed the action of the Church in this matter, that the government of India have, in the Despatch, for the first time, moved in the way of secular education; that the Despatch was, in short, the inauguration of Secularism in India, and that we were called as a Church to put our imprimatur on this new system. They have exhausted all their eloquence in the denunciation of Secularism; and while the holy band of devoted Missionaries, who have gone forth to India, with their lives in their hands, have been exclaiming with one voice, "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes;" the cry raised in opposition is, "This is Satan's work, and it is hateful in our eyes." Dr Veitch has quoted several passages from Dr Duff's works, exposing the evils of Secularism, and the infidelity of which it is productive in India. But I could crowd my pages with declarations still stronger, both from Dr Duff and other Missionaries, who gave their evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Lords,* and who were unanimous in proclaiming the mighty evils of Secularism.† But how is it that these Missionaries,

* See Appendix C.

† The evidence taken before the Select Committee of the House of Lords would seem to establish that as many converts to Christianity have been educated in the Government Colleges, as in the Missionary Institutions, but it would

impressed with the incalculable evil of a Godless education, how is it, that they should hail the Despatch of 1854 as forming the most glorious era in the history of India, and as clearly evincing the hand of an overruling and gracious Providence? The reason simply is, that they were thoroughly acquainted with the principle and the design of the Despatch. They well knew that the principle of the Grants in Aid to Christian bodies introduced a new element, and one antagonistic to the secular system which had been long in operation; and the grand recommendation of the system in their eyes was, that the government did not dare to assume the functions of the Church of Christ, but left to each religious body the unfettered jurisdiction of its own schools. The grand cause of the misconception at home was the ignorance of the fact that the government has had all along a system of secular education widely ramified throughout India; and that the Despatch of 1854, instead of inaugurating an era of Secularism, had for its great object the introduction of the Christian element, and that in such a form as might ultimately supersede altogether the purely secular schools.* In the Despatch, then, there are two systems of education laid down, and one great principle adjusting the relation of the one system to the other, forms the distinctive feature of the Despatch. The one system is a modification of the

be a fallacious conclusion that their conversion is due to the former. In most cases, their conversion can be traced to subsequent instruction in Missionary Institutions, or to contact with those trained in such institutions.

* The late Governor-General, Lord Dalhousie, expressed the following opinion of the Despatch in a minute dated 28th February 1856:—"It contained a Scheme of Education for all India, far wider and more comprehensive than the Local or Supreme Board could ever have ventured to suggest. It left nothing to be desired; if, indeed, it did not authorize and direct that more should be one than is within our present grasp." See "Selections from the Records of the Government of India."—No. 14.

former secular one under the exclusive superintendence of government; the other system is the religious one, under the exclusive superintendence of Christian Churches, but at the same time aided by the State. The grand fundamental and distinctive principle of the Despatch is the recognition of the antagonistic character of the two systems, and of the expedience of making the secular system yield before the religious.

The grand fallacy of the impugners of the Church's decision consists in confounding the two distinct and antagonistic systems. They denounce, in terms which merit all commendation, the secular system of the Despatch, and leave it to be inferred that this is the system of which the Church has approved; whereas the step she has taken is the most emphatic protest against this system. This attempted identification of two totally distinct systems forms the staple argument of every speech and pamphlet on the subject. This, too, it is to be feared, is the argument employed in contumacious appeals from the pulpit, by which it has been attempted to alienate the hearts of the people from the Missionary work, and to tamper with their Christian liberality. It is to be deplored, that a party, however small, within the pale of a Missionary Church, should so far misconceive the most marvellous opening for the gospel at the present time, as to have, by their attitude of opposition, the appearance of fighting against God. So obstinate has been the misconception on the subject of the two distinct systems of the Despatch, that a member of last Assembly, who took a prominent part in the discussion, thought it necessary to appeal to the Court of Directors to remove the doubt. He knew, that however palpable the distinction might be in the Despatch itself, the prejudices of many might prevent

them from seeing it. The answer, of course, was, that Grant-receiving Christian schools were totally distinct from the secular schools of government; and that they did not in any way compromise their spiritual independence by the receipt of Grants.*

While one great object of these remarks is to exhibit the evils of secular education, and to prove that the church-and-school system is the only one in which we can have a satisfactory guarantee for the religious element, it is important that we should clearly understand in what the evil of a secular system of education consists. There can, of course, be nothing sinful in teaching children simply to read, write, and cast up accounts, any more than in teaching them mechanical trades, which trades, indeed, form part of the ordinary school training of many of the government schools. The evil lies not in what is taught, but in what is not taught. The sin is of omission, not of commission. The fault is one of defect, not of positive wrong, at least where merely the mechanical elements of education are communicated. The grand defect of the secular system is, that it provides merely for time, and leaves eternity out of account. It looks upon man merely as a member of human society, and forgets that he has an immortal soul that ought to be trained for the society of heaven. The government of India, as a purely secular body, gives only the secular element, which in itself is a good thing, and calls upon the Christian Church of Christ, as a spiritual body, to communicate the spiritual element, and offers the most liberal aid to enable it to do so. Surely it is not a right position for the Church to take, to insist upon a merely secular body

* See Appendix E.

assuming a function, which, by Divine right, belongs to herself alone.*

But let us ask how the minority would have the government act in reference to religious education. Fortunately, Dr Veitch has left us in no doubt upon this subject. Here is his plan :—"Their obvious duty was, in their system of education, to set forth the profession of their own faith; and less they surely could not have done, than apply to all their schools the Minute on Education issued by the Marquis of Tweeddale, while Governor of Madras, but recalled by the Company, in which he earnestly recommended that a Bible class should be formed for the instruction of those, and those only, who were themselves willing to attend." One feels utterly astounded at such a proposition, coming from a minister of the Church of Scotland, and one who professes to value a definite system of religious education. He calls upon this secular body of directors to draw out a profession of their faith, and inculcate it upon the population of India. Let us assume that all the Directors are Christian men,—which, of course, from the constitution of the Court, we are not entitled to do;—but let us suppose that they have all some form or other of Christian creed; is their compound creed to comprehend all the contradictory tenets of their individual creeds, or is it to be a general confession, from which all the distinctive peculiarities of the Christian faith are to be eliminated? The first supposition is too monstrous to be entertained; and we are, therefore, forced to the conclusion that the latter is meant. This confession then of mere "form and contour," to use the language of Germany on the same subject, is to be the creed of India. And, after all, this

* See Appendix B.

deistical religion is not to form part of the ordinary teaching of the school. It is to be a separate thing, and not at all to be urged upon the attention of the heathen. It is only when the young heathen, voluntarily, form a class to learn this strange creed, that it is to be taught. But, then, the Bible is to be taught in this voluntary class; taught by men who are bound to interpret it according to the vague creed professed by the Directors. Is not this only giving a stone, when the perishing millions are crying for bread? Let it not be thought that the mere reading of the Bible would redeem this system from the charge of being anti-Christian. The Bible is read in the schools of Prussia, and in the common schools of America, under a system similar to the one propounded; and what is the result? Why, that the teaching is not merely secular, but positively anti-Christian. The evidence before the Committee of the House of Lords brings out the remarkable fact, that even though the Bible has been excluded, hitherto, from the government colleges, the students, nevertheless, are, on the whole, better acquainted with the Bible, than the students at college in this country. The European books, which they are required to master, so frequently allude to the Bible and Christian doctrine, that they have been forced to form an acquaintance with the Scriptures accessible to them in every library. They devour its contents with the greatest avidity; and, yet, what is the result? Does this mere intellectual knowledge make them Christians? So far from this, they are distinguished by their bitter hostility to the Christian faith. What is the natural deduction from all this? Is it not that the Bible must be taught by religious men, who are at liberty to bring home to the heart the whole truth

as it is in Jesus. And how are we to have a reasonable guarantee for such teaching? Not, surely, by asking a secular body, who can, from the nature of the case, profess no definite system of religious faith. Are we not forced into the divinely appointed guarantee of the Christian faith? If we abandon God's way, and adopt one of man's devising, must we not be prepared for anything but a satisfactory result. It seems that the Rajah of Travancore, and several other native princes, have introduced the reading of the Bible into their schools; and this, at first sight, may appear a great triumph. But these native princes apprehend no danger to their own faith. They know that the Bible is quite an innocent book, when interpreted by a Pundit or Malauvi, who will show it to be a curious but very sorry purana of the European conquerors. This seems to put in the strongest light the folly of expecting satisfactory results, unless the Bible be taught by religious men, whose character is guaranteed by the unfettered jurisdiction of the Christian Church.

But will it be believed, that the Despatch contains the very provision which Dr Veitch would be disposed to regard with so much favour? There is, actually, a clause sanctioning this voluntary religious class; but the Despatch has been so ill read that it has been overlooked. The following are the words of this clause:—" Moreover, we have no desire to prevent or to discourage any explanations which the pupils may, of their own free will, ask from their masters upon the subject of the Christian religion, provided that such information be given out of school hours." The precious boon, then, of a separate and voluntary class for religious instruction is actually secured;

and it may be interesting to know how this illusory concession was granted. In the course of the parliamentary investigation, in 1853,* which was intended to guide the Directors in framing an educational measure, some Missionaries, and friends to Missions, when asked how they would propose to introduce the Christian element, did, indeed, think that a voluntary Bible class in the government schools might be of advantage; but all agreed, that the cause of Christianity would be infinitely more benefited, by government acting in India through the various Christian churches, each Church receiving Grants in proportion to its educational activity. Now, what did the government of India do under these circumstances? Which of the two measures, recommended to them by Christian Missionaries was adopted? Why, they went beyond all the expectations of the Missionaries; for, instead of limiting themselves to one measure, they agreed to adopt both. They granted—what was considered by all the boon of greatest value—aid to Missionary schools; but, as weight was attached to some religious action in their own schools, they agreed to allow of voluntary teaching. The Missionaries who had most experience in India deprecated above all things, as a course likely to prove most injurious to the cause of Christ, any direct enforcement of religion in the government schools.† This testimony is quite in accordance with the views of the far-sighted founder of our India Mission. He, too, regarded any direct interference of government as a thing to be altogether deprecated. The Directors, then, in framing

* See "Second Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Indian Territories;" also "Sixth Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Indian Territories."

† See Appendix F.

their new educational measure, yielded to the voice of Missionary wisdom of India. They refrained from any direct interference, and aided the cause of Christianity by bestowing grants on the Missionary schools.

Knowing all this, it is matter of no ordinary surprise, that the Governors of India should be denounced as the enemies of Christianity. For let it be kept carefully in mind, that when they are charged with respecting Satan's dominion or doing his work, the denunciation falls really upon the Missionaries of India, or rather upon the Missionary wisdom of Christendom; for almost every Protestant Church has its Missionary representatives in India. How is it that Dr Veitch, who must be assumed to be really interested in the cause of Missions, should put himself in the extraordinary position of virtually accusing Missionary Christendom of respecting Satan's dominion in India, by devising the scheme which the India government has adopted? Now, it is abstractly possible that Dr Veitch may be right, and the whole Christian world wrong; but there is an explanation far more probable, and Dr Veitch himself furnishes us with the ground of explanation. He says, " A question of principle can in fact be better determined at home than abroad ;" and then descants upon the prejudices of Indians. Now, there is no doubt that a principle is independent of latitude, just as a proposition of Euclid is as true at the pole as at the equator. But, then, the question in this case is not, Is such a principle true or false? but, What is the real principle involved? The charge brought against the opposers of the Church's measure, is not that they have pronounced a good principle to be bad, but that they have, deliberately, kept themselves ignorant of what the real principle is; and they have done

this on the mistaken notion that we need no light from India to aid us in the matter. Now, I hold, that we must go to India to interpret the language of the Despatch, and thus to ascertain the real principles involved in it. There are terms—such as "inspection," "affiliation," "neutrality"—that cannot be fully understood without a reference to the educational history of India; and it is because due attention has not been paid to the educational state of India, past and present, that so many have been bewildered about the principle involved. No doubt, it is far easier to judge of the principle, without any reference to India. It is far more agreeable to shun the toil of mastering ponderous blue-books, and voluminous reports of Missionary associations and government inspectors; and, in the dim light of prejudice, to decide, in luxurious ease, upon the principles involved; but if we are to come to a right conclusion, we must seek light wherever it is to be found.

Let us for a moment turn to the history of government education in India. There are three distinct periods: the first commences with the time of Warren Hastings, who, in 1781, founded the Mohammedan College, which was afterwards assumed by government. This period continued up to 1835. Its distinctive character was the exclusive encouragement of native literature and science, communicated through the medium of the classic languages—Sanscrit, Arabic, and Persian. The principle was, that the cultivation of the intellect, though it should be in connection with false systems of science, was better than absolute ignorance. It was imagined, at this time, that any attempt to found a better system would awaken a spirit of wide-spread disaffection. The evil of this policy soon became ap-

parent. Instead of conciliating the learned classes, who alone had the benefit of it, it only made them more bigoted and intolerant. The next period commenced in 1835. The educational minute of Lord William Bentinck, in this year, effected an entire revolution. Instead of encouraging merely oriental literature, through the medium of the classic languages, it was resolved to substitute European literature, conveyed through the medium of the English language. Although a slight modification was afterwards effected by Lord Auckland in 1839, in favour of orientalism, still, the distinctive feature of this period was the preponderance of European literature and science. The object was, to a certain extent, accomplished, of bridging over the vast gulph between the Hindu subject and the Englishman. The young men trained in the government colleges were, to all intents, Englishmen: their thoughts and feelings were cast in European moulds: and thus a fusion of the two races was effected in a great measure. Still, the greatest element of national union was wanting; and, without this element, it was seen that mere European education would shake, instead of strengthen, the foundations of our Eastern empire.* The religious element was wanting; and without this the reins of government could be held, only with a trembling hand. But how was the religious element to be introduced into the education of India? With all the old traditions of danger,—with the mutiny of Villore still vividly remembered,—how would the government dare to give Christianity a lever power to root out the superstitions of India? Some feebly talked of voluntary Bible classes in the government schools; others

* See Appendix C.

dared to dream of government enlisting the Missionary bodies in the work ; but none contemplated such a measure as that of the Despatch of 1854, which inaugurated the third or Christian period of education. This measure went beyond the expectations of the most sanguine. So far, then, from the Despatch being a measure thrust upon the Christian community of India, it is a graceful homage to the Christian faith. The plan was one suggested by the Christian wisdom of the Missionaries and others deeply interested in the temporal and spiritual welfare of India. The merit of the Directors lies in listening to the Christian feeling both at home and abroad. Can it be matter of surprise, then, that the era of 1854 was hailed by the Christian community of India with feelings of devoutest gratitude? There was no jarring note to mar this holy joy. Even those who, from special circumstances, such as the American Missionaries, could not avail themselves of the Grants, joined with their brethren in devoutly acknowledging the hand of a wise overruling Providence.

Having so fully considered the fundamental principle of the Despatch, and having exposed the misconceptions on this subject, it will be only necessary to advert, very briefly, to a few subordinate points.

The term *affiliation* has played, in the present controversy, a most important part; but it owes its undue importance to an entire misconception of its meaning. The meaning put upon it, for controversial purposes, is one that implies an assimilation of the Missionary schools to the secular schools of government. It will be seen, from what has been said, that the fundamental principle of the Despatch is the recog-

nition of the antagonistic features of the Missionary and secular schools. It has been, all along, taken for granted by the minority, that when a school receives a government Grant, it becomes an affiliated school; now, there is no connection whatever between Grants and affiliation. A school may receive a Grant without affiliation, and schools may be affiliated without any Grants. The term affiliation has reference merely to the relation existing between a university and its associated colleges. The university is the *alma mater*, and the colleges are regarded as so many daughters. The bond of connection between the colleges and the university is termed "affiliation." This term has no reference whatever to elementary schools, which may receive Grants without any claim whatever to be affiliated. Our Female Orphan Refuge in Calcutta, it is ascertained, is entitled to receive a Grant; but of course it has no claim to be affiliated to the university. So carelessly, however, has the Despatch been read by those who have used the most intemperate language, that the whole of their wrath is based upon an absurd blunder. The very title of Dr Veitch's pamphlet exhibits the blunder in the most glaring form,—"Reasons against Affiliating our Christian Mission to the Secular System of Government Education." This, of course, assumes that the acceptance of Grants, according to the deliverance of last Assembly, necessarily implies affiliation; whereas we may accept Grants for all our schools, and no affiliation follow as a necessary consequence.

Our Missionary institution at Calcutta, however, ranks as a college, and the Despatch recognises it as worthy of affiliation. But the honour of affiliation may be enjoyed, though no Grants be obtained; nay, what is more, our institution may be affiliated without

our consent; and, most probably, our Calcutta institution enjoys that privilege at the present moment without the Church of Scotland ever knowing of it. It is still more startling to learn that our institution has been virtually affiliated ever since 1844, the year of Lord Hardinge's educational resolution on the subject; and what forms the climax of the whole is, that this resolution was hailed with gratitude by every Missionary body in India as a boon of inestimable value. The only difference is, that instead of "affiliation," the much stronger term of "incorporation" was employed. Dr Duff, in his evidence says, "The design of Lord Hardinge's Minute, therefore, was hailed at the time by all parties as a noble and generous design."* Before this period, only the students from the government institutions were admitted to those examinations which determined the candidates' qualifications for holding government appointments. The students from the Missionary institutions were not admitted, though their education was of as high an order. The consequence of this civil disability was, that while the students were shut out from those positions to which they had a right to aspire, they were looked upon by the natives as of a degraded or pariah caste. The reclamations of the Missionary bodies were so loud, as to extract from Lord Hardinge the above resolution. The measure, after all, was inoperative and illusory, as the students were examined only in books used in the government institutions. That ground of complaint is now removed, as books, such as Paley's Evidences and Butler's Analogy, used in the Missionary colleges, are admitted as tests of the

* "Second Report of the Lords' Committee on Indian Territories," questions 611, 612, of Minutes of Evidence.

intellectual qualifications of the students for civil offices. From all this, it appears that affiliation is only the removal of civil disabilities under which Christian students formerly laboured. The former examining board is now converted into a university board, but the functions are essentially the same.

As we have, in Scotland, no university distinct from a college, we are apt to confound their respective functions, and to overlook the fact that a university board is merely an examining board. We have, however, in the University of St Andrews, an illustration that will serve our purpose. This university has no medical college of its own, and therefore acts, in reference to the medical profession, purely in the capacity of an examining board. The university affiliates the various medical colleges, simply by admitting their students to examination for degrees. It does not require the consent of these colleges. It has only to satisfy itself that the requisite course of study is pursued in them, and they are at once affiliated by simply admitting the students to examination. It appears, then, that affiliation is, properly, a matter between the university and the student, and not between the university and the college. In the case of our institution at Calcutta, the university has only to send an inspector to any of the public examinations, and, if satisfied with the course of study, can be at once affiliated, without any arrangement whatever with the managers. Even though we should wish that the civil disability should be maintained, the government could defeat our purpose by emancipating the students, and putting them on a level with their fellow-subjects. The only way we could attain our object, supposing the Church of Scotland capable of such a thing, would be by lowering the stand-

ard of education, so as to disqualify our students for government appointments. Now, all these facts were perfectly accessible to Dr Veitch. By simply reading the Despatch with care, and turning over the pages of a blue-book, he would be saved from occupying the not very enviable position of making sweeping and unfounded charges against a Church, which he is bound to love and honour.

The next subject that demands attention is that *of inspection.* While the Missionaries unanimously assented to the principle of Grants in Aid, as the most desirable on the ground of principle, they admitted, at the same time, that inspection was the correlative of grants; that government was entitled, by their own officials, to see that the money was properly expended. They, however, most scrupulously guarded against any claim to religious interference. They could not, for a moment, admit the principle that the official of a secular body had a title to pronounce an authoritative opinion on the nature of the religious instruction communicated. The Missionary teacher, while freely presenting his pupils for examination, in secular branches, was to have the right of forbidding any religious interference. The government at once conceded this as reasonable, and gave strict injunctions that, even though the religious teaching should be carried on in his presence, the inspector was not to presume to report upon it. Every regard, then, was paid to the reasonable scruples of the Missionary bodies. How strange, then, that this point of greatest excellence in the system should be the very one singled out for the bitterest invectives. Were we to insist on the inspector's assuming religious action in virtue of his secular office, we

would merit the worst taunts about Erastianism which our enemies have launched against us. As a matter of mere abstract principle, the creed of the inspector is not an essential element in his fitness for the performance of a purely secular duty ; but, practically, it is desirable that he should be a man in whom the parties with whom he deals may have confidence. In the indigenous schools, he is to be one in whom the natives have confidence. A similar boon is offered to the Missionary schools. In the case of the Church of England schools, a clergyman of that communion has been appointed inspector. In regard to the possibility of a Hindu being appointed, there could, on the point of principle, be no more objection to his inspection than to the employment, in Missionary schools, of heathen teachers in the secular branches of education. Now, Dr Duff, writing in 1844, tells us that nine-tenths of the teachers in our Missionary schools are heathen. But just as such teachers are far from desirable, so it would be satisfactory that the inspector should be a man for whose moral and religious character we had some guarantee, and this point the government are willing to concede.*

The religious *neutrality* of the rulers of India has been violently assailed, and religious neutrality denounced as in all cases wrong. Now, though the vin-

* From an examination of the Inspector's Reports, it would appear that the interpretation put upon the restrictive clause is such as to allow them to examine the religious instruction, provided they report only on the secular element. If the class-book be the Bible, they ascertain the proficiency of the pupils in reading it, while they do not report on the doctrines taught. The teaching of the Bible, Church Catechisms, &c., may, then, embrace as much of the secular element as to entitle the school to a grant ; so that, in Missionary Schools, no change requires to be made in the subjects taught. See "Report on Applications for Grants in Aid in the Madras Presidency, 1856." "General Report on Public Instruction in the Lower Provinces of the Bengal Presidency for 1855-56."

dication of the Assembly's decision only requires it to be shown that the Directors have acted properly, so far as we are concerned, still it is important to have a clear understanding of this question of neutrality. Such a position as the above can be maintained only on the basis of the grossest Erastianism. There are cases where anything but religious neutrality would be sinful in the extreme. To decide in any particular case, we must examine the constitution of the neutral body, and the matter in regard to which it is neutral. Take, for example, a parochial board, administering relief to the poor. It would be sinful in this secular body to be anything else but neutral in doling out allowances to the poor. They are bound to keep the poor from starving, irrespective of their religion. They are not entitled to say to the Roman Catholic pauper, You must either starve or take our Protestantism along with our gift. To be anything but neutral in such a case would be an outrage on every feeling of justice; and yet every member of the board may be a pious Christian, ready to promote the interests of religion in the right way. The government of India are, like a parochial board, a purely secular body, and they are anxious to bestow temporal gifts upon their poor subjects. They, for example, wish to bestow a knowledge of agriculture, the want of which is so frequently the cause of famines: must they say to the natives, Unless you take our religion, you will get no agricultural schools, and so be left to perish from your ignorance? Anything but religious neutrality in such a case would be a grievous wrong.

Again, a body may be neutral as to direct action, and the reverse of neutral as to indirect action. The East India government are neutral as to direct action, in so

far as they do not presume to control the religious element in the school; but they are not neutral indirectly, as they give the various Christian Churches the means of planting the Cross on the ruins of the Eastern superstitions. Sinful neutrality exists where the party, empowered to communicate religious truth, make a compromise of the doctrines of revelation. Dr Veitch's plan for the religious education of India is a good illustration of this. He would endow the Directors with religious functions, in virtue of which they are to profess their faith and teach this faith to the natives. This faith must necessarily be a neutral compound, as among the Directors all shades of religious opinion must be supposed to exist. Popery and Protestantism, Arminianism and Calvinism, Presbytery and Episcopacy, would form the acid and alkaline bases from which the neutral compound is to be formed. But as the properties of an elementary body may be altogether lost in the compound, so the distinctive truths of our religion would be altogether obliterated in such a compound neutral faith. But this is the kind of positive action Dr Veitch would substitute for their present neutrality.* The Directors have wisely followed a more scriptural course, and assigned to the Church direct and distinctive action in the matter of religion.

The Church of Scotland receives salaries for her chaplains in India; but by so doing she does not homologate the wrong policy of government in other cases, though the money for the right and the wrong comes from

* The motto of Dr Veitch's Pamphlet, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers," is specially applicable to this Common-school system, in which truth is necessarily yoked together with error. In the system of Grants in Aid there is no yoking at all; each church occupying an independent sphere, and teaching the whole truth as embodied in its standards.

the same chest. Apart from the abstract principle, the very nature and conditions of society imply that, by co-operating with the government in what is right, we are not committed to what is wrong in their policy. The answer to this by Dr Veitch is, that the cases of chaplains and Missionaries are not parallel; that chaplains receive grants as ministers of the gospel, whereas Missionaries are paid only for their secular work. But mark the bearing of this argument on the case of Roman Catholic chaplains, for they receive salaries as well as Protestants. These chaplains are recognised, according to this doctrine, as ministers of the gospel; and though they preach deadly doctrine, it is less sinful to give Grants to them, than to Missionaries for teaching merely reading and writing, even though they give sound religious doctrine in addition. It is comparatively easy to vindicate the educational neutrality of the government of India; but it would require no ordinary amount of casuistry to prove that a system subsidizing religious error, *as such*, is free from blame.

In regard to the Privy Council Grants in this country, the position, which the Church has by her various decisions taken up, is this: "We are ready to allow that other religious bodies beside the Church of Scotland should receive Grants in Aid; but then we hold that, by the constitution of the country, the government is *pius et Christianus*, and bound to discriminate between truth and error, and to bestow aid accordingly. The State may err in judging of religious truth, and bestow Grants on bodies that inculcate error; but we are not implicated in the guilt. We protest against the endowment of Popish or other error; but we do not act inconsistently when we ac-

cept Grants for Protestant truth. The acceptance of what is right only strengthens our protest against what is wrong." In like manner, the Church of Scotland accepts Grants for her own chaplains in India; but she does not attempt to vindicate the principle of endowing Popish chaplains. She acknowledges that the thing is wrong, but protests against being implicated in the guilt.

In reference to the Church's sanction of the Grants in Aid, it is argued that it is one thing for the Church, as a Church, to put her *imprimatur* on the system, and a very different thing for her committees quietly to take the Grants without saying anything about it. Now, there is a difference; but surely it is more becoming a Christian church to proceed in an open straightforward manner, and take the whole responsibility, than, by a Jesuitical evasion, connive at the proceedings of her committees, while trying to keep herself clear of all responsibility. The Church of Scotland adopted the more manly course, by giving her direct sanction in the most authoritative manner.

The sum of our argument, under the head of principle, is this, that the Directors have adopted the most scriptural course, by enabling the Church to impart the religious element, instead of themselves assuming the spiritual functions which belong to her alone; and that the plan proposed by Dr Veitch, while commencing with the vague religion of the common-school system, would inevitably end in out-and-out Secularism.

III. *The question of expediency.*—While many of the minority freely admit that the principle of the Grants is unobjectionable, they at the same time hold that,

as a matter of expediency, the Church should not accept the Grants. It is held that the nature of our institutions is such, that the acceptance of Grants would necessarily divert them from their original purpose. This is a question which can be decided only by an appeal to facts.

In order to draw a marked line of distinction between the Church's schools at home, and her schools in India, Dr Veitch entirely surrenders the ground on which the jurisdiction of the Church over the parish schools is defended. " The Missionary institutions are not schools in the ordinary sense of the term; they are schools in strict subserviency to the Church ; they are schools in which secular knowledge is imparted, not for its own sake, but as subsidiary to the opening of the youthful mind in India to the Word." This reasoning, of course, implies that the Church's schools at home are not in strict subserviency to her, and that secular instruction is the main, not the subsidiary object. The cause of religious education in Scotland is lost, if such loose notions are to prevail. The doctrine of the Church is very different, for her solemn Testimony of 1849 declared, that the teachers in her schools are ecclesiastical persons, and therefore exercise spiritual functions. Secular knowledge, then, is not the main, but the subordinate object of the parish schools. Christianity is regarded as the divinely appointed element for developing the moral, religious, and intellectual nature of man ; and the mechanical and secular branches of education are only the instruments through which the great end is attained. The Missionary schools do not differ, then, in fundamental principle, from the Parish Schools; the difference is one merely of me-

thod; in both the salvation of the soul is the grand object, and secular education plays only a subordinate part. Though the methods by which the common object is to be carried out be in the mean time different, the ultimate object is just to give to India the blessing of Scotland—an educational system which shall form part and parcel of the Church.

The practical question in reference to the acceptance of grants is this: Are the present methods, employed in our Missionary institutions, of such a nature that Grants are inapplicable? Does secular knowledge play so unimportant a part in carrying out the design of these institutions, that it would not be wise to stimulate it too much. Now, this is a very fair question, and it is one not to be answered in the spirit of *à priori* dogmatism. The answer can be drawn only from a knowledge of the character and condition of the people, and from the experience already gained on the subject.

Two specifically distinct methods of educational operation have been advocated, and put to the test of experience. The one method is that of dilution, the other of concentration. The one, at once, embraces a large basis for its operations; the other prefers occupying at first one strong central position, from which its influence may gradually diverge. The one deals directly with the many, the other with the few, who are ultimately to tell upon the many. The one expends its energy in elementary education; the other concentrates its forces on education of a higher order. The one trusts more to European influence, at once made to bear upon the masses; the other depends for an abundant harvest more upon a native ministry thoroughly furnished for the work of proclaiming Christ to their

fellow-countrymen. Before the establishment of our institution at Calcutta, the former plan was almost universally adopted, but the founder, with his characteristic sagacity, at once saw that the conversion of India merely by European agency was utterly hopeless; and his primary aim, in the scheme which he projected, was to raise up native agents to tell upon the masses of India.* He adopted, as a necessary consequence, the second of the above methods of operation; and, under his guidance, the Church founded an institution at Calcutta, at which a high standard of education might be given; and where, by remaining for a series of years under the superintendence of our Missionaries, the pupils might be more deeply imbued with a Christian and evangelizing spirit. The Missionaries who had expended their efforts in elementary education, found that, to a great extent, their labours were lost, as the effect soon disappeared where there was not a church organization to continue what was begun in the school. The principle of our institution soon commended itself to almost every Christian body in India, and it has been looked up to as a model institution for exercising the most permanent Christian influence upon the natives. The educational tendency has, therefore, been to follow in the path of the Church of Scotland; not that elementary education is neglected, but it is confined within limits commensurate with due ecclesiastical superintendence, according to the original plan. The original scheme of Dr Inglis has been carefully carried out; our institution contains, in addition to a preparatory school, the elements of a normal school, and a divinity hall—the great object being to keep up a supply of native teachers and preachers; while, at

* See Appendix B.

the same time, many young men go forth to fill civil offices, where their Christian influence may tell powerfully on the native population.

Before the expediency of accepting Grants can be determined, we must ascertain whether the training of teachers and preachers requires such a high standard of general education as to be benefited by the stimulus of Grants. Now, all acquainted with India unite in the opinion, that the reasons for a learned ministry at home are enhanced tenfold by the peculiar circumstances of the Hindoo population. The subtle intellect of the Hindoo; his deep reverence for learning; the high standard of education which many of the natives now receive; the fact that their religion is very much a matter of literature and science;—these, and other circumstances, all combine in demanding a learned ministry for India. In proof of this, we have only to look at the programme* of the studies at our institution before Grants were ever thought of, to see what standard of education was required on purely religious grounds. From the list of works read and used as text-books in the institution, it will be seen that, if taught with ordinary success, our students ought to be fully a match for the students in the government colleges, with whom, under the operation of the Grants, they would be brought in competition. These Grants, then, will only tend to maintain a standard of education which has been all along thought essential for the success of our institution, as an instrument for diffusing the blessings of Christianity among the native population.

It has been said that the Grants will give an undue preponderance to the secular element; but where there

* See Appendix F.

is religious superintendence, the secular and religious elements do not conflict with, but mutually aid, each other. Does not experience bear out this position? Is it not found to be the general rule in our Parish and Assembly Schools, that where the secular branches are well taught, there is a corresponding excellence in the religious department? Secular knowledge is God's truth as well as the Bible; and it would be the greatest libel on the latter to hold that there is a necessary conflict between them. It is only when secular knowledge is divorced from Divine truth, that it leads to such deplorable consequences. Combined with Divine truth, its necessary tendency is to elevate the Christian character. Inspectors' reports of the Missionary Grant-receiving schools have already been published, and it is interesting to observe, that those schools which receive the highest praise for the secular element, are those that stand highest for the religious element;* and in passing, it may be observed, that the inspectors, though the Despatch does not empower them, do not scruple to report on the religious teaching when the managers of the school do not object.†

The Assembly of last year were startled, in no ordinary measure, by the astounding proposal to level our central institutions at the Presidency, and to devote all the resources of the Church to the preaching of the gospel. All that the Church had been fostering with so much care, and for so many years, was to be destroyed, that things might work smoothly at home.

* See "Report of the Director of Public Instruction in the Lower Provinces for the Second Quarter of 1855-56."

† The schools under Schwartz, in the Tanjore circle of Missions, enjoyed Government Grants long before the Despatch of 1854. The great success of these schools shows that government aid, as offered by the Court of Directors, is quite compatible with the object of Missionary labour.

The tree that had been tended with so much care was to be cut down, when about to yield, in the most abundant measure, the fruit that was so long expected. This proposal was made upon the ground that the general spread of education afforded an inviting opening for increased energy in this direction. But was it a wise proposal to destroy the very means which enabled us to take advantage of this opening? There can be no doubt that a period has now arrived, when the preaching of the gospel must have greater prominence; but that is the very ground on which we would maintain, in all their efficiency, our central institutions. Now, what is the due development of our institutions, retained in all their integrity? Is it not, as our resources will admit, to settle, in favourable localities, native evangelists trained in our institutions, and to establish schools side by side with the Church?—these schools being taught by teachers also trained in our institutions. Our object must be to give to India the blessings of a religious establishment, the counterpart of the Church at home. This being the case, the proposal to destroy our central institutions would be equivalent to the attempt of the Russians to cut off our forces before Sebastopol, from Balaclava, the basis of their operations. We might as well expect a tree to flourish and bear fruit, when cut off from its roots, as to expect to evangelize India by preachers and teachers when cut off from their training institution. The life's blood of our Missionary action must pulsate from the central institution, as the heart of the whole system. The grand recommendation of the Grants in Aid is, that, by doubling our resources, they enable us to take full advantage of all our previous labours, and to

develop our mission so as to meet the present wants of India.

I differ entirely from some of my brethren, who advocate Grants in Aid, as to the efficacy of a widely spread system of vernacular education, independent of a corresponding expansion of the preaching element. The resources of the Church would be, on this plan, wasted; and, besides, such a course would be to return to the policy against which our own central institutions are a distinct protest.* A mere educational machinery, unconnected with the preaching of the gospel, would also be a departure from the divinely appointed method of converting the world. The extension of the school must only keep pace with the extension of the Church, if we are to derive the maximum effect from the resources at our command. There is a growing conviction in the Church, that it is now full time to make an onward movement as to the preaching of the gospel; and I am fully persuaded that this conviction will form a basis of union and harmonious action, which, with mutual forbearance, will yet heal the present unhappy breach. Much prejudice has arisen against the decision of the Assembly, from the idea, that it was intended to make education a substitute for the preaching of the gospel, whereas nothing more was meant than that the one element should expand in due proportion with the other. On the other hand, there is little sympathy in the Church with any attempt to check the growth of our educational institutions, on the mistaken idea that they may now be dispensed with. It may be said that the government is now doing the work of education for us; but their secular education is not of a

* See Appendix D.

kind that can be assimilated to the life of the Church. With such views, held in common by the vast majority of the Church, it is not to be believed that the opposing parties will continue to distract the Church on a subject which, above all others, requires hearty and harmonious co-operation.*

I am well aware that some of the most esteemed and influential ministers of the Church, while repudiating the extreme views I have been combating, think that there are reasons, special to our Missions, why Grants should not be accepted. Now, this is quite possible, just as, in several cases, Grants have already been rejected by Missionary schools, though the soundness of the principle on which the Grants are offered has not been impugned. The American Missionaries, for example, have not accepted them, as such acceptance would infringe on the distinct nationality they are desirous to preserve, and would appear like a compromise of their voluntary principles, though not so in reality.† Some Church of England schools have also declined them, on the ground that the interference of government in religion, however indirect, might prejudice the cause of Missions; the natives, in such localities, being exceedingly jealous of any attempt on the part of government to proselytize. Such special reasons may render it inexpedient for the Committee, even with decision of last Assembly, to accept of Grants in the case of particular schools. It is, of course, the duty of the Committee to inquire into such special cir-

* For an interesting discussion of the relative advantages of various Missionary agencies, see "Proceedings of a General Conference of Bengal Protestant Missionaries, held at Calcutta, 1855."

† "Reports and Letters connected with Special Meetings of the Mahratta and Tamil Missions of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions in 1855, printed for the use of the Prudential Committee." See also Appendix E.

cumstances, and to refuse Grants, should the Church consider her operations in any way compromised by such acceptance. The deliverance of the Assembly necessarily gave such discretionary power to the Committee.

Before concluding, it may be necessary to advert to the unfortunate position taken up by some parties in reference to the binding character of the Assembly's decision. It is held that the decision of last year is not to be regarded as the decision of the Church of Scotland. This is surely strange doctrine,—a kind of ecclesiatical repudiation that can reflect no credit on the Church, if we could conceive it possible for her to act upon it. The measure, indeed, did not pass the Barrier Act; but it will not be seriously argued that the Church is committed to no measure which does not pass this Act. The Barrier Act refers only to a well-defined class of measures, and the Assembly are the sole judges whether any particular measure comes within the scope of its provisions. Neither the Assembly of 1855, nor that of 1856, deemed this matter one to which the Act was applicable, and it will not do to say that the Church is not responsible for the measure. It is the glory of the Church of Scotland that she was the first Protestant Church to enter as a Church on the field of Missionary enterprise. Is she now to be told that she is to be robbed of that honour because the original measure did not pass the Barrier Act? In all her Missionary action she has dispensed with this formality; and it will not do to divest her of the honour of last year's decision, which forms the second great era in her Missionary history. It was because the Church felt she was committed, as a Church, to the decision of 1855, that she so eagerly rose to re-

verse it in 1856. It is quite competent for her again to reverse her decision. There is no obstacle to this, but a regard to her own consistency and dignity; and it is not reasonable that she should sacrifice both, to propitiate a small protesting party. There must be something like continuity and consistency in the policy of the Church, if she is to do God's work to purpose, and if her people are to repose confidence in her integrity and wisdom.

Though there is so much that is objectionable in the Pamphlet which has formed the subject of my strictures, there are passages, insisting on the importance of the religious element in education, which merit all commendation; and though the policy advocated by the author would necessarily lead to an opposite result, yet it would be injustice to deny him the credit of a sincere and hearty desire to secure the religious education of the young both at home and abroad. It is to be devoutly hoped that he, and those who act with him, may yet see eye to eye with their brethren, and be led, cordially, to co-operate with them, in ushering in the glorious day of gospel light, now dawning on our Eastern Empire.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX A.

Resolution of the Commission of Assembly of March 1850.

"While of the funds which they fervently trust will be now supplied by Parliament with no niggardly hand, in aid of the means of education in Scotland, they will respectfully claim for *all* schools connected with the Church an equitable share, they feel it to be their duty, in conformity with the view of the question taken by the last Assembly, fully to acquiesce in the principle which provides for the allocating of a proportion of such funds, in aid of schools belonging to other Christian denominations."

In the Assembly of 1851, Dr Veitch made a motion to the effect that the denominational clause of the Protest, Declaration, and Testimony, should be struck out. In opposition to this, the following resolution was carried:—"That in reference to the educational wants of the country, and the means offered for the supply of these, in the form of Grants from the public funds, under the administration of the Committee of Council on Education, while there are parts of that system of which the Church does not approve, the General Assembly see no reason to depart from the course adopted in the proceedings of the Assembly 1849, in regard to this matter, in which it was found that the conditions on which these Grants are offered, are such as the Church can accept without any compromise of her rights and principles, and the General Assembly declared their adherence to the 'Protest, Declaration, and Testimony,' forming the 9th act of the said Assembly 1849."

APPENDIX B.

Extracts from a "Letter to the People of Scotland" by Dr Inglis, as Convener of Assembly's Committee, dated April 1826. (See the Letter, just republished, *in extenso*.)

"We have no desire to conceal that, to a certain extent, there appeared a disinclination on the part of the natives to the instruction of their chil-

dren in the principles of our religion; nor can it be matter of wonder that parents, who are themselves votaries of idolatrous worship, should be so disinclined. As little have we a desire to conceal that they who have in their hands the government of India, have most wisely and discreetly prohibited all offensive interference with the religious opinions of the natives. Indeed, every motive forbids it. The slightest apprehension of an authoritative religious interference would tend more than anything else to counteract our labour for their good. But that which authority could never have accomplished, has been, in a great measure, effected by more honourable means.

"Yet, let it not be inferred from our having said so much upon schools and other seminaries of education, that we for a moment lose sight of the more direct means of accomplishing our object by the preaching of the gospel to the heathen world. We have men anxious to develop the importance of the auxiliary instrument which we mean to employ, that the prospect of benefit resulting from it might be more clearly discovered; but it is in subserviency to preaching that we would, in this case, devote our labour to the education of the young. By reference to the plan of procedure, which has already received the sanction of the General Assembly, it will be seen that the head-master of the very first seminary of learning which it is proposed to establish, is to be an ordained minister of our National Church, with a view to his both preaching to the natives and circulating among them religious tracts, illustrative of the import and the evidences of the Christian faith; nor is it to be regarded as anything more than the *commencement* of a plan for religious instruction, which is to be gradually enlarged, in proportion as the requisite funds are supplied, and opportunities of usefulness are multiplied."

EXTRACT from the REPORT of the COMMITTEE of ASSEMBLY, appointed to devise a plan for the accomplishment of the Assembly's object in reference to the Propagation of the Gospel abroad. Report approved May 1825.

"That, under all these conditions, with reference to the necessary funds, it would be desirable to establish, in the first instance, one central seminary of education, with branch schools in the surrounding country, for behoof of the children of the native population, under the charge of a head-master, who ought to be an ordained minister of our National Church, and not less than two assistant teachers from this country, together with a certain number of additional teachers, to be selected by the head-master from those natives who have previously received the requisite education.

"That the head-master (being, as already said, a clergyman) ought to embrace opportunities as they occur, to recommend the gospel of Christ to the faith and acceptance of those to whom he may find access."

APPENDIX C.

SECULAR EDUCATION.

Evidence from Minutes taken before the Select Committee on Indian Territories.

Dr Duff.—"I have never ceased to pronounce the system of giving a high English education without religion as a blind, short-sighted, suicidal policy.

"I have a very strong and decided impression upon that head (danger of secular education to the British power), not so much from theory,—though much may be advanced in the way of argument in the abstract—as from actual experience, having come in contact with individuals, brought up under both systems, to a very large extent. At the same time, as regards the working of the non-Christian system, it must be remembered that the aspect of things is somewhat different from what it was some twenty years ago. The young men brought up in the Government Colleges at Calcutta and elsewhere are now coming more or less in contact with the other class of young men, equal to themselves in literary and scientific attainment, but who are also many of them under Christian influence, and some of them Christian altogether. Such contact, as might be anticipated, is beginning to exercise a beneficial influence over them ; so that we have not now to do with such a large proportion of those who would indulge in the wild freaks and extravagances so peculiarly characteristic of the class usually designated "Young Bengal." For the spirit of Young Bengal, while recklessly poor in speech, and essentially infidel in religion, is, I am bound to add, anything but friendly at bottom to the British Empire.

"Wild notions spring up among them (Young Bengal) as to parental rights and filial obedience, and various other social obligations. Finding this to be the state of things, there was a great anxiety to see what could be done to arrest this wild rolling tide. They look on Christian Ministers as in the same category with the Brahmins; that is, as mere pretenders, upholders of priestcraft, and impostors.

"It is a simple and notorious fact, that at that time (1830) they were without any belief,—that they were really infidels in the widest sense of the term; in fact, avowed atheists. They have never been, at any subsequent period, in a state of such frenzied extravagance; and all this was brought about, not by Missions or Missionaries, but by the joint action of the government and natives themselves."

Sir C. E. Trevelyan.—"European knowledge does not give the effectual motive which a firm belief in Christianity gives, but it creates a conscience. It puts that into their minds which will continually ferment, and prick them until it leads them into a full knowledge of the truth. The human being requires the comforts and hopes of religion; he cannot do without them; and Hindus are even less liable to do without them than western nations, who are made of sterner and more self-relying stuff.

These nations must have some religion. They cannot go back to Hinduism. They will not turn aside to Mohammedanism. They have not the slightest disposition to do so. They must, therefore, go on to Christianity; and many circumstances tend to favour this progress to Christianity."

W. N. Bird, Esq.—" The young men from the Colleges under Government are inferior to those educated in the Missionary schools. I do not mean in classical attainments, but generally in character. They are like what young men would be in this country if educated under similar circumstances, without any sound principle. Having thrown off all the trammels of Hinduism, and having, in short, no religion whatever, but having passed through the College, and having their minds enlightened by knowledge obtained in it, they go to the Missionary schools, and there learn Christianity, by which many of them become Christians."

APPENDIX D.

MISSIONARY EDUCATION.

Dr Duff *in Minutes of Evidence before Select Committee of the House of Lords.*—" What one would say on the whole would be this, that a combination of the two (vernacular and higher) in due measure and proportion, would make a perfect system. We must have a basis of vernacular and elementary instructors, of more or less extent, in order to furnish materials for our higher institutions; but to attempt to diffuse mere elementary education alone throughout the masses of India at this moment, even if it were possible, could not lead to the higher and more desirable results. One would say, then, that to have a large proportion of these elementary schools, to furnish materials for higher institutions; and a fair proportion of these higher institutions to bring up to a consummation, as it were, all the improved processes and riper products of these elementary schools, would be the most effectual means of diffusing real knowledge throughout the land. We cannot make any real advance without a class of men of superior talents and acquirements, who may be variously employed as agents in the great cause of native enlightenment; without higher institutions such qualified agents never can be trained. The great thing, therefore, should be to aim at securing some of those higher institutions for the purpose of bestowing these higher acquirements on the few; and then to employ the instructed few in elevating the condition of the uninstructed many, by extending wider and wider the basis of a sound elementary education."

Extract from a Tract on "Missionary Schools," by the Senior Member of the Deputation to India from American Board of Missions.

" Ages of experience in Protestant Christendom have shown that connecting a small system of schools with the frequent preaching of the Gospel, is wise as a means of increasing the effect of preaching and the

durability of its influence, and if it be so within the bounds of Christendom, why not beyond. If the circumstances differ, as they do very greatly, the difference only shows the greater need of connecting schools with preaching among those who know not the Gospel. When occupying a fixed station, the ordained Missionary will no more be without such schools than the pastor at home. After all, we cannot undertake to educate the youth of the whole heathen world, nor even any considerable portion of them. Whatever may be proper or desirable for us to do in a general point of view, the scantiness of the means placed at the disposal of the Missionary societies render it expedient, yea unavoidably necessary, that schools, at the expense of such societies, be established on a limited scale. We can educate only the few, and they must educate the many. The plan suggested would involve a seminary of a higher order in each considerable Mission, which would receive pupils from the preparatory schools and conduct them through a course of liberal education, more or less protracted. They should combine the College and the School of Theology."

Lord William Bentinck, *in his Address to the Missionaries of Bengal on his departure from India.*—"Being as anxious as any of these excellent persons for the diffusion of Christianity through all countries, but knowing better than they do the ground we stand upon, my humble advice to them is, rely exclusively upon the humble, pious, and learned Missionary. His labours, divested of all human power, create no distrust. I will give them, as an example, in support of this advice, the school founded exactly upon these principles, lately superintended by the estimable Dr Duff, that has been attended with such unparalleled success."

William Wilberforce Bird, *in Evidence before Select Committee of the Lords.*—"I believe that the Committee have heard from Dr Duff a description of the way in which his pupils are instructed; and I know from recollection, that they are a great deal better instructed in the Bible than the generality of Europeans. It is considered generally as the best Missionary school. It is on a system different from that of the Missionary schools in general. According to my information there are 22,000 scholars of all classes in the Government schools in India, and 113,000 scholars in the various Missionary schools."

APPENDIX E.

Part of Evidence before the Select Committee on Indian Territories.

Lord Stanley of Alderley.—"Will you state what you propose the government should do towards the further improvement and extension of education in India?"

Dr Duff.—"The time has come, in Calcutta at least, where, with comparatively little additional expense to government, a university might be

established, somewhat after the general model of the London University, with a sufficient number of faculties, constituted on so wide a basis as to embrace within the range of its stimulating and fostering influence whatever sound, invigorating, purifying, elevating studies may be carried on in any, whether of the government or non-government institutions.

"The time has come, when, in the growing conviction of numbers in this country and India, the government ought to extend its aid to all other institutions, by whomsoever originated and supported, where a sound general education is communicated. I would trust to its (this plan) intrinsic rightness and desirableness, so far as it goes; I say so far as it goes, because I do not regard it as absolutely the best that could be conceived or desired, but only the best that seems practicable amid the heterogeneousness of hostile interests and opinions, without involving the sacrifice or dereliction of any fundamental principle of truth or rectitude. Looking, then, at the subject broadly in all its bearings, I have for several years past entertained the persuasion that the principle on which the government at home has been distributing its educational funds, is the only principle on which, in the very peculiar and conflicting state of things in India, the British government there could practically interpose for the encouragement and assistance of all parties engaged in the great cause of improved education.

"It is simply the application to India of the principle upon which the British government acts here in Great Britain; namely, the principle of proportionally helping all who help themselves, on condition that the government may be allowed to take cognisance, throughout our institutions, of that department with which the government as such can grapple; that is to say, the department of a sound general education, leaving the matter of religious instruction as a thing to be determined by the several parties themselves; while the government maintains towards them the attitude of a strict neutrality, interfering neither by its injunctions nor its prohibitions."

6252. "You would not wish to see any religious element introduced into any of these schools!"

"Not as enforced or directly controlled by government. That is the reason why I have stated that I do not desire that the government, as such, should take immediate charge or cognisance of religion in these schools, or in any way hold itself officially responsible for it."

J. C. Marshman, *in Evidence before Select Committee.*—"It must not be forgotten that some, even of Europeans, who have been at the head of the government institutions, have been either so indifferent or so hostile to the doctrines of Christianity, that it would have been exceedingly unwise to have placed the instruction of the pupils in the doctrines of the Bible in their hands; and as a large proportion of the teachers in those institutions are Hindus, they would, in a great measure, be disqualified also from giving instruction on the truths of the Bible, which they did not themselves believe. However desirable, therefore, it might be that there should be a union of Secular and Religious Education in India, I should hesitate to recommend, at this time of day, to introduce the Bible into the Hindu College, or any of the other Colleges in Bengal. I might mention, that a return was drawn up some 12 months ago of the number of Students in English who had embraced Christianity. I think the number

was about 70; of these, one-third consisted of men who had received instruction in the government institutions, from which Christianity was excluded. The other two-thirds were the result of Missionary tuition.

"I propose that government should grant a sum of money in aid, but not that it should take upon itself the entire support of these institutions (unconnected with government); it is also of great importance that the government should make no inquiry whatever with regard to the religion which might be taught in any of these institutions, but give its assistance simply upon the ground of the secular instruction which was communicated there."

Rev. J. Leechman, *Theological Tutor in the Serampore College, in Evidence before Select Committee.*—" I should think it better, both for political and religious reasons, not to introduce the Bible into government schools. The masters, however, I think should be left at liberty in these matters to act as they thought best; and after school hours, at their own houses, Christian teachers should have liberty to teach the Bible to all who might be desirous of hearing the truths of Christianity. Similar evidence was given by Rev. J. Kennedy, agent of London Missionary Society."

Evidence in favour of Grants in Aid was also given by the Bishop of Bombay, the Bishop of Madras, the Rev. William Keane, Secretary of Church Missionary Society, the Rev. J. Fuller, Secretary to the corresponding committee of the Church Missions Society, &c., &c.

Resolutions of the Threefold Conference of the Propagation of the Gospel, the Christian Knowledge, and the Church Missionary Societies.—1. " That the object for which a yearly sum for educational purposes is set apart by the East India Government is to promote a good general education, to be ascertained on the Report of their inspectors among all classes of the inhabitants of India. 2. That every school in which such general instruction as shall reach the standard prescribed by the competent authorities conveyed is entitled to the benefit of the government grant." The Conference therefore agreed to accept the grants.

From Proceedings of " American Board of Commission for Foreign Missions." Madras Report.

" The Despatch on Education from the Court of Directors promises great good to India; but it will be realized very much in proportion as Missionaries and other Christians adopt the plan. If the aid is all given to schools where the Bible is not taught, the desired end will be in a great measure defeated."

From Report of Special Committee on the " American Deputation to India." Resolution of the Board of Commission for Missions.

" That this Board deems it inexpedient to receive Grants in Aid from government by the Missions, when such appropriations are accompanied

by certain conditions which may lead to embarrassment in the practical working of the system."

The following is part of the "Memorial on Education," written by Dr Chalmers shortly before his death:—

"It were the best state of things, that we had a parliament sufficiently theological to discriminate between the right and the wrong in religion, and to encourage or endow accordingly. But failing this, it seems to us the next best thing, that in any public measure for helping on the education of the people, government were to abstain from introducing the element of religion at all into their part of the scheme; and this not because they held the matter to be insignificant—the contrary might be strongly expressed in the preamble of their act—but on the ground that, in the present divided state of the Christian world, they would take no cognisance of it just because they would attempt no religious control over the religion of applicants for aid—leaving this matter entire to the parties who had to do with the erection and management of the schools which they had been called upon to assist. A grant by the state upon this footing might be regarded as being appropriately and exclusively the expression of their value for a good secular education."

"East India House, *7th February* 1856.

"Sir,—I have laid before the Court of Directors of the East India Company your letter, dated 22d ultimo, having reference to the system of Grants in Aid, which now forms part of the general arrangements for the promotion of education in India. The particular question to which you seek an answer is to use your own words, 'Whether the schools referred to in the 53d paragraph of the Court's Despatch of the 19th July 1854 will become government institutions on receiving Grants in Aid, subject to the regulations in reference to the Bible, laid down in the 84th paragraph of the same Despatch?' In reply to this question, I am commanded to state, that the government wish distinctly to disclaim any interference in the general management of schools, maintained by public bodies or associations, which may participate in the Grants in Aid, beyond the right of inspection,—that such schools will not become government institutions, and that, consequently, they will not be liable in any way to the regulations specified in the 84th paragraph of the Court's Despatch of the 19th July 1854.—I am, Sir, yours, &c.

"James C. Melvill.

"The Rev. W. F. Irvine, Arbroath."

APPENDIX F.

Programme of the Tenth Annual Examination of the Pupils attending the General Assembly's Institution, 1841. Given in Appendix G., to Minutes of Evidence taken before Select Com-

mittee of the Lords on Indian Seminaries. The subjects of the higher classes only are given.

COLLEGE DEPARTMENT.—FOUR CLASSES.

Third Year's Class.—Bible; Paley's Evidences; Lectures on Theology; Clift's Political Economy; Milton's Paradise Lost; Four books Duncan's Lectures, the whole; Solid Geometry; Eleventh and Twelfth Books of Euclid; Physical and Practical Astronomy; Use of Instruments; Text-books, Mylne and Herschel; Statics, including the Composition and Resolution of Forces; Mechanical Powers, &c.; Brewsters Optics; Mental Philosophy; Dr Brown's 1st vol. and part of 2d.; Bengali, Mudhal, Chaidra's Grammar, &c.; Hindostani, four Gospels; Char, Darvesty, and Hindostani reader.

Fourth Year's Class.—Have finished all the preceding branches of study, together with a full course of Analytical Trignometry, and Analytical Geometry, and during the present session have studied the Bible; Brown's Mental Philosophy, 1 vol. and part of vol. 2d.; Thomson's Differential Calculus, the whole; Thomson's Integral Calculus, first principles; Laplace's Mechanique Celeste, first chapter.

PREPARATORY AND NORMAL SCHOOL.—FOURTEEN CLASSES.

FIRST OR HIGHEST CLASS.

New Testament—two Gospels and part of the Catechism. Horne's Manual of the Evidences, 65 pp. History,—Marshman's Brief Survey, 1st and 2d volumes; the whole of Marshman's History of India down to A.D. 1450, 174 pp. Goldsmith's History of England to Charles I. Murray's English Grammar. Macculloch's Course of Reading, 167 pp. Arithmetic, Simple Interest; Algebra, Division of Fractions; Geometry, First and Second Books, and 20 problems of Third Book of Euclid, Bengali, Hetopadish, 74 pp.

SECOND CLASS.

New Testament—Gospel by Matthew, part of Luke and John. History—Brief Survey, whole of Volume First, and 43 pages of Volume Second. Sessional School Collection, whole. Murray's Grammar, whole. Arithmetic—Decimal Fractions. Geography—Keith's Use of the Globes. Geometry—all the First Book of Euclid. Bengali, Hetopadish, 47 pp.

THE END.

PRINTED BY NEILL AND COMPANY, EDINBURGH.